## Case 3:16-cr-00244-SI Document 7 Filed 07/06/16 Page 1 of 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	Case No. CR 16-00244 SI
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
JAMEN Collins Defendant.	101 6 2016
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on Speedy Trial Act from <b>July 6</b> , 2016 to <b>Jul</b>	, 2016, the Court excludes time under the object of the court and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § sees this continuance on the following factor(s):
	be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the proor law, that it is unreasonable to expedience.	due to [check applicable reasons] the number of rosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial d by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, e diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given itments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
	unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time king into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	•
DATED: 3-6-16	Sallie kun
	SALLIE KIM United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney